INTRODUCTION

The Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa—Its Nature and Scope

1. The *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* (*SK*) in four chapters is a basic work of *Mīmāṁsā* by Jaimini, which, together with his better known and widely studied *Tantra Kāṇḍa* or *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*, makes up the complete *Pūrvamīmāṁsā-Śāstra*. The main object of the *SK* is the redaction of those principles of interpretation of *Dharma* which had not been included in the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*.[1] It also forms a continuation of and supplement to the last two chapters of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* in that, like those two chapters, *viz.*, the *Tantra* and the *Prasaṅga adhyāyas*, it too has been composed for the interpretation, on the principles of *upadeśa* and *atideśa*, of *Dharma* set forth in obscure and ambiguous Vedic passages.[2] It bases itself mainly on the rules enunciated in the first twelve chapters and discusses the further application of those rules to other *mantras* in some other contexts.[3]

2. A short commentary on the *SK*, the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, by the 18th century polymath Bhāskararāya, has since long been before the scholars[4] but the original *Sūtras* were not to be had. This made the work appear suspect. The truncated topical (*adhikaraṇa*) *Sūtras* available with the commentary hardly helped to clear these doubts; in fact they only served to deepen them.[5] A unique manuscript of the original *Sūtras*, now discovered and presented here in a critical edition with a detailed discussion on the genuineness and authenticity of the *SK*, should suffice to dispel the doubts hitherto entertained about this ancient work.

---

1. *Cf.* धर्मविचारार्थं द्वादशलक्षणीं कृत्वा, तत्रासूत्रितान् कांश्चिन्न्यायानालक्ष्य तत्संग्रहार्थं द्वादशलक्षणीशेषं सङ्कर्षकाण्डं कृतवतो महर्षिवरस्य जैमिनेः etc. *Brahmasūtra-Kalpataru-Parimala* of Appayya Dīkṣita, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1917, p. 50.

2. *Cf.* द्वादशलक्षण्यविचारितनानाविषयन्यायविचारात्मकः तत्परिशिष्टः तन्त्रप्रसङ्गवदुपदेशातिदेशसाधारण्येन प्रकीर्णकः प्रवर्तितः। *Ib.* p. 838.

3. *Cf.* एवं द्वादशभिरध्यायैः प्रकृतिविकृतिभेदेन कतिपयान् न्यायान् संशोध्य तैरेव न्यायैः इतस्ततो विप्रकीर्णान् वेदवाक्यार्थान् ऐदंपर्येण सम्यक् निष्कृष्य निर्णेतुमेषा चतुरध्याय्यारभ्यते। Intro. to his commentary on *SK* by Bhāskararāya, p. 1.

4. *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa*, Ed. Pt. Swāmi Rāma Miśra Śāstrī. *Pandit Reprint*, Banaras, 1894.

5. See for instance, the objections of M. L. Sandal, below, § 7.

Manuscript of the Sūtras

3. The discovery of this manuscript of the *SK Sūtras* was made in the family collection of 767 palm-leaf and paper manuscripts of R. Krishnaswami Sastri of Tanjore acquired by the late R. A. Sastri some years back for the Madras University Library. This manuscript, No. 62 of the collection, is in palm-leaf (7½"x1¾") and is written in very readable and generally correct Grantha script. Folio 1 of the manuscript commences with the sūtra स आहवनीयः स्यादाहुतिसंयोगात्, being XII.iv.24 of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. The last chapter of the *Dvādaśalakaṣaṇī* is concluded on folio 2 with the colophon: द्वादशस्य चतुर्थः पादः. The *SK sūtras* are commenced next and are continued upto folio 21, where the manuscript breaks off with the first *sūtra* of ch. II, *pāda* i, of the *SK*. Though written in close continuation of the *Dvādaśalakaṣaṇī*, the *SK* is considered here as a separate work, its chapter and *pāda* colophons reading, सङ्कर्षकाण्डे **प्रथमस्य प्रथमः पादः, प्रथमस्य द्वितीयः पादः** etc. It may, however be noted that the flyleaf of the manuscript, on which are written some of the *pratīkas* of the sūtras, treats the *SK* as an organic continuation of the *Dvādaśalakaṣaṇī*, the chapter prefixes given there being '१३ अध्याये," and "१४ अध्याये".

Viṁśatyadhyāyaṁ Mīmāṁsā-Śāstram

4. Tradition holds that *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* in its full form consists of twenty chapters, the first sixteen constituting *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* and the remaining four, *Uttara-Mīmāṁsā* or *Vedānta*. Thus, in his *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya*, Śaṅkara implies that the '*Śāstra*' commences with the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā-Sūtras* when he says, on *Brahmasutra* III.iii.53 : ननु **शास्त्रप्रमुख** एव प्रथमे पादे शास्त्रफलोपभोगयोग्यस्य देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनोऽस्तित्वमुक्तम् । सम्यगुक्तं भाष्यकृता [शबरस्वामिना] न तु तत्रात्मास्तित्वे सूत्रमस्ति । इह तु स्वयमेव सूत्रकृता तदस्तित्वमाक्षेपपुरस्सरं प्रतिष्ठापितम् । Śaṅkara further terms the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras* the 'First treatise' (*prathama-tantra*) and the *Vedāntasūtras*, the 'Remainder' (*śeṣa*) of the 'Full *Śāstra*' (*kṛtsna-śāstra*) ; *cf.* अत एव च भगवता उपवर्षेण **प्रथमे तन्त्रे** आत्मास्तित्वाभिधानप्रसक्तौ "शारीरके वक्ष्यामः" इत्युद्धारः कृतः । इह चेदं चोदनालक्षणेषूपासनेषु विचार्यमाणेषु आत्मास्तित्वं विचार्यते **कृत्स्नशास्त्र**-शेषत्वप्रदर्शनाय । (*Bhāṣya* on III.iii.53). This tradition is discernable down the ages.

5. On the composition of the *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra*, the *Prapañcahṛdaya* which sets out to describe the various systems of traditional learning elaborates thus : तत्र साङ्गोपाङ्गस्य वेदस्य पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डसंभिन्नस्याशेषवाक्यार्थविचार-परायणं **मीमांसाशास्त्रम्** । तदिदं **विंशत्यध्यायनिबद्धम्** । तत्र **षोडशाध्यायनिबद्धं पूर्वमीमांसा-शास्त्रं** पूर्वकाण्डस्य धर्मविचारपरायणं जैमिनिकृतम् । तदन्यदध्यायचतुष्कं उत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रं

उत्तरकाण्डस्य ब्रह्मविचारपरायणं व्यासकृतम् ।[6] Rāmānuja, the expounder of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of Vedānta, observes: मीमांसाशास्त्रम्—'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' (*Mīmāṁsāsūtra* I.i.1) इत्यारभ्य 'अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात्' (*Brahmasūtra* IV.iv.22) इत्येवमन्तं सङ्गतिविशेषेण विशिष्टक्रमम् ।[7] His follower Vedāntadeśika says the same thing with the further detail that totally the *Śāstra* consists of twenty chapters: 'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' (*Mīmāṁsāsūtra* I.i.1) इत्यारभ्य 'अनावृत्तिः शब्दादनावृत्तिः शब्दात्' (*Brahmasūtra* IV.iv.22) इत्येवमन्तं **विंशतिलक्षणं मीमांसाख्यमेकं शास्त्रम्.**[8] The same author introduces his comments on the first sūtra of *Mīmāṁsā*: विंशतिलक्षणयां वक्ष्यमाणं कृत्स्नवेदार्थविचारं प्रतिजानीते—'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' (I. i. 1).[9] Exponents of other schools also refer to the complementary nature of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī, Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* and *Brahmasūtra.* Epigraphical evidence for the twenty-chapter division of *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* is forthcoming in a South Indian inscription, No. 76 of 1932-33, from Anur, Chingleput Dt., Madras, dated A.D. 999, where, among other qualifications for a Brāhman to receive *Bhāṭṭa-vṛtti* ('living for a learned Brāhmaṇa'), a knowledge of the *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* in "Twenty chapters" is prescribed.[10]

The SK and its genuineness

6. By its very structure the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* (*Tantra Kāṇḍa*) of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsa-Śāstra* was self-complete so far as the enunciation of the principles of interpretation of *dharma* and the elucidation of the methodology of the application of Vedic *mantras* were concerned. And this rusulted in the *Dvādaśālakṣaṇī* being considered, rightly enough, as a complete work. It gained also wide prominence through the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara and the *Vārttika* of Kumārila, and the mass of literature which followed in their wake. These two circumstances had the ultimate effect of throwing the second part of the work, *viz.*, *SK*, into disuse and oblivion[11] to such an extent that serious doubts have been

6. Edn. *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series*, No. 45, pp. 38-39.

7. *Cf. Śrībhāṣya* of Rāmānujācārya, *Bombay Skt. and Pkt. Series*, No. 68, pp. 2-3.

8. See his *Seśvaramīmāṁsā*, *Śāstramukthāvalī*, No. 16, Conjeeveram, 1902, p. 1.

9. *Ib.* p. 3.

10. On this see S. Krishnaswami Ayyanagar, *Woolner Com. Volume*, Lahore, 1930, 1 ff.

11. *Cf.* आसीत् षोडशलक्षणी श्रुतिपदा या धर्ममीमांसिका
सङ्कर्षाख्यचतुर्थभागविधुरा कालेन साऽऽजायत ।
Bhāskararāya, concluding verse of his com. on the *SK*, *Pandit Reprint*, p. 127.

expressed by modern scholars even on its genuineness. The non-availability of manuscripts of the work coupled with the fragmentary, imperfect and unconnected nature of the topical *sūtras* in the *Pandit Reprint* only augmented these doubts.

7. Thus M. L. Sandal in the Introduction to his English Translation of the *Mīmāṁsā Sūtras* has raised several points in this respect.[12]

"(In the *SK*) there are no *adhikaraṇas* and the *sūtras* are meagre ; it is an apocryphal portion of the *Mīmāṁsā*, most probably palmed off by Khaṇḍadeva as genuine." (i)

"All the writers of the *Mīmāṁsā* have characterised Jaimini's *Mīmāṁsā* as containing twelve chapters." (ii)

"Strange to say that the *SK* is not mentioned by Alberuni and Abul Fazal." (iii)

"The *SK* never found popularity amongst the students of *Mīmāṁsā*, and was, therefore, very properly consigned to oblivion. We do not find it mentioned in any ancient works prior to Rāmānuja in his *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* or Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in *Prasthāna-bheda*." (iv)

"The style of the so-called *Sūtras* does not resemble that of Jaimini ; it is so very curt and mutilated that one cannot make out anything without the help of Bhāskara's *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*." (v)

"The last *sūtra* in the fourth *pāda* of the fourth chapter, which is the 16th chapter in the work, ends with the word यथा याज्यासंप्रैषः which has been repeated and imitated from the final endings in the *Sāṁkhyapravacana* or the *Vedāntasūtras*." (vi)

"It is a valuable work in *Mīmāṁsā* literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpa Sūtras*. It does not criticize any general principle as is done by Jaimini in his *Mīmāṁsā*. The well-known twelve principles have been discussed in the twelve chapters by Jaimini ; but in the work under description (*SK*) there is a simple description of the post-sacrificial minor ceremonies, which really form the subject of the *Śrauta* part of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. In this view which I take of the *SK*, it cannot be considered a supplement of Jaimini's *Mīmāṁsā*." (vii)

"I am of opinion that *Saṅkarṣaṇa* is a spurious work. Further I am of opinion that the work as it exists now in the present form, is either the work of Khaṇḍadeva or of Bhāskara." (viii)

---

12. Pub. *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, Allahabad, 1925, Pp. x-xii.

8. A careful examination of the *SK* and the references to it in later literature will show that the above objections have all been raised probably due to the insufficiency of reference and manuscript material of the *SK* available at the time when these objections were raised. In a learned paper on the subject, the late Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri has endeavoured to meet these obections effectively.[13] It might still be worthwhile, in this context, to consider these objections afresh in the light of the additional materials which have come to light as a result of further investigation.

9. (Obj. i and viii) The statement that there are no *adhikaraṇas* and that the *sūtras* are meagre is based on the presumption that the fragmentary words printed in bold type at the head of each paragraph in the *Pandit Reprint* comprise the *sūtras* of the work. In fact they are only the initial letters of the topical (*adhikaraṇa*) *sūtras*. The error in the statement will be obvious on an examination of the full *sūtras* now discovered and edited in the following pages. It may also be noted that neither is there the absence of *adhikaraṇas* nor are the *sūtras* meagre either in form or in number. Attention may be drawn here also to the fact when *SK sūtras* are referred to in later works, it is done so generally with reference to their *adhikaraṇa*, just as in the case of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī-sūtras*. *Cf. Prabhāvalī* of Śambhubhaṭṭa on Khaṇḍadeva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* : इदं हि प्रथमाध्यायसङ्कर्षकाण्डस्थं **सप्तमाधिकरणसूत्रम्** । तत्र हि etc. (Edn. *Madras University Sanskrit Series*, Pt. I, 1957, p. 434, on *Mīm. sūtra* IV. iii. *adhi*. 15) ; अत्र च सङ्कर्षे द्वितीयाध्याये "मध्यमायामुपसद्यग्निश्चीयते प्रकृत्युपकृतत्वात्" (*SK* II. i. *adhi*. 26) **इत्यधिकरणे** etc. (Edn. N. S. Press, Bombay, 1921, p. 212a, on *Mīm. sūtra* II. iii. *adhi*. 10) ; *Adhvara-Mīmāṁsā-Kutūhala-Vṛtti* of Vāsudeva Dīkṣita : सङ्कर्षकाण्डे द्वितीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयपादा**द्याधिकरणे** etc. (Edn. *Vani Vilas Sastra Series*, No. 1, Srirangam, 1907 ff., p. 160, on *Mīm. sūtra* II. ii. 2).

10. To say either that the work is "most probably palmed off by Khaṇḍadeva" or that it is the work of Khaṇḍadeva (15th cent.) or Bhāskara (18th cent.) is equally unwarranted, for, besides references, specific and implied, to its author being Jaimini (see below § 19), the *SK* has been made mention of and quoted many centuries prior to Khaṇḍadeva by several authorities including Śabarasvāmin himself who quotes from *SK* with mention of its name in his *Bhāṣya* on the *Mīm. sūtras* X. iv. 32 and XII. ii. 11 (see below § 20). Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Śrīkaṇṭha quote from

---

13. 'The *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa*—A Genuine supplement to the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra*', *Indian Historical Quarterly*, IX (1933) 290-99.

the *SK* in their Bhāṣyas on the *Brahmasūtra* प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तम् (III. iii. 43).[14] Other authorities earlier to Khaṇḍadeva (15 cent.) like Vedāntadeśika (13-14 cent.) in his *Seśvaramīmāṁsā* (*ib.* pp. 2, 6) and the *Prapancahṛdaya* (*ib.* p. 39) refer to it (see above § 5). Even the references that Khaṇḍadeva makes to *SK* in his *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* are quite natural in their contexts; also they are so commented upon by his own pupil Śambhubhaṭṭa in his *Prabhāvalī*. *Cf.* on *Mīm. sūtra* IV. iii. *adhi.* 11 : 'यच्छकुपात्तवात्' इति दक्षिणाभेदाम्नानाच्च प्रयोगभेदस्य **सङ्कर्षे वक्ष्यमाणत्वात्** । Com. : **चतुरध्यायात्मकसङ्कर्षकाण्डमीमांसायामित्यर्थः** । (*Bhāṭṭadīpikā* with *Prabhāvalī*, *Madras Univ. Skt. Series.* 1957, Pt. I. p. 425) ; On *Mīm. sūtra* IV. iii. *adhi.* 15 : 'क्रत्वङ्गत्वं वा चित्येत्वङ्गे नोपपद्यते' (*SK* I i. 15) इति **सङ्कर्षणसूत्रं** तु क्रत्वपूर्वोपयोगाभिप्रायं व्याख्येयम् । Com. : इदं हि प्रथमाध्याय**सङ्कर्षकाण्डस्थं** सप्तमाधिकरणसूत्रम् । तत्र हि etc. *ib.* p. 434).

11. (ii) The remark that "*all* writers of the *Mīmāṁsā* have characterised Jaimini's *Mīmāṁsā* as containing twelve chapters" has to be taken as an overstatement, in view of the fact that though the twelve-chapter-*Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* is taken as a self-complete unit and spoken of as such, when the question of the '*entire*' *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* is considered, authorities speak of the *Ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇī*. *Cf.* Rāmānuja : तदाह वृत्तिकारः–"वृत्तात् कर्माधिगमादनन्तरं ब्रह्मविविदिषेति" । वक्ष्यति च कर्मब्रह्ममीमांसयोरैकशास्त्र्यं, "संहितमेतच्छारीरकं **जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति** शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः" इति । (*ib.* p. 2). Vedāntadeśika has the same quotation from Vṛttikāra Bodhāyana

---

14. *Śaṅkara* : तस्मात् पृथगेवोपगमनम् । प्रदानवत् । यथा 'इन्द्राय राज्ञे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालम्, इन्द्रायाधिराजाय, इन्द्राय स्वराज्ञे', इत्यस्यां त्रिपुरोडाशिन्यामिष्टौ 'सर्वेषामभिगमयन्नवद्यत्यछंवट्कारम्' इति । अतो वचनादिन्द्राभेदाच्च सहप्रदानशङ्कायां, राजादिगुणभेदाद् याज्यानुवाक्याव्यत्यासविधानाच्च, यथान्यासामेव देवतापृथक्त्वात् प्रदानपृथक्त्वं भवति । एवं तत्त्वाभेदेऽपि आध्ययांशपृथक्त्वाद् आध्यानपृथक्त्वमित्यर्थः । तदुक्तं सङ्कर्षे—'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' (*SK* II. ii. *adhi.* 15) इति । तत्र तु द्रव्यदेवताभेदाद् यागभेदो विद्यते । नैवमिह विद्याभेदोऽस्ति । (Edn. *Brahma-sūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya* with the com. of Govindānanda, Vācaspati and Ānandagiri, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1909, p. 755-56).

Rāmānuja ; प्रदानवदेव प्रदानवदावर्तनीयमित्यर्थः । तदुक्तं सङ्कर्षणे—'नाना वा देवता पृथक्त्वात्' (*SK* II. ii. *adhi.* 15) इति । (*Śrībhāṣya*, *Bombay Skt. and Pkt. Series*, No. 68, Bombay, 1914, p. 659).

Śrīkaṇṭha : 'इन्द्रप्रदानवत् यथा 'इन्द्राय राज्ञे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालम् । ......स्वराज्ञे' इति गुणभेदात् पृथक् पुरोडाशप्रदानम् । 'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' (*SK* II. ii. *adhi.* 15) इति सङ्कर्षे तथोक्तत्वात् ।

in a different context : उभयाभिप्रायवेदी भगवान् बोधायनो विंशतिलक्षणीं मीमांसां परस्परसंगमार्थं विस्तरेण व्याख्यादिति वृद्धा विदामासुः । तथा च स्वयमेवाह—"संहितमेतच्छारीरकं **जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति** शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः।" इति । (*ib.* p. 45). *Cf.* also the passage : आसीत् **षोडशलक्षणी** श्रुतिपदा या धर्ममीमांसिका from Bhāskararāya quoted above (fn. 11).

12. (iii) The non-mention of the *SK* by Alberuni and Abul Fazal, while the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* is mentioned by them, can at best point to the wide prevalence of the latter work, but cannot be an affirmative argument for the non-existence, at that time, of the *SK* in the light of the evidences pointed out above.

13. (iv) Neither can the argument that the *SK* is not mentioned in any ancient work prior to Rāmānuja or Madhusūdana Sarasvatī stand when it has been shown above that not one, but several authorities prior to Rāmānuja have referred to the *SK* by name and have quoted from it. The work has also been commented upon by early authors (see below § 24-25).

14. (v) The statement that the style of the *sūtras* does not resemble that of Jaimini has obviously been made on the basis of the mutilated bits of a few of the *sūtras* found in the *Pandit Reprint.* An examination of the full text of the *sūtras* of ch. I now available will fully prove the error of the above observation and will also show how close it is to the style of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī.*

15. (vi) The repetition of the words in the concluding sūtra as याज्यासम्प्रैषो याज्यासम्प्रैषः is necessary for the sense of the *sūtra* even as Bhāskararāya shows in his commentary ; it should also be taken as an auspicious ending to the entire *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* ; *cf.* Bhāskararāya: भ्राजस्वन्तं यजेति याज्यासम्प्रैषावृत्तिदर्शनात् । सूत्रे वाक्यावृत्तिः 'शास्त्र'-परिसमाप्तिद्योतनार्था । (*Pandit Reprint*, p. 126). It can never be asserted without any tangible evidence that "it is imitated from the final endings in the *Sāṁkhyapravacana* or the *Vedāntasūtras.*"

16. (vii) Sandal is right in saying that the *SK* is a valuable work in *Mīmāṁsā* literature and is in the nature of the *Kalpa Sūtras.* It is as it should be. For, the main object of the *SK* is not the enunciation of new principles for the interpretation of *dharma* but the application of known principles to ambiguous Vedic passages which require such elucidation (see above). The likeness, therefore, which some portions of the *SK* might bear to the *Kalpa Sūtras* does not go against the authenticity of the *SK*; it may only support its authenticity.

17. In a recent publication, *Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya* (*Deccan College Dissertation Series*, No. 8, Poona, 1952), D. V. Garge seems to present a divided opinion, first conceding the probability but then expressing a doubt, when he says, pp. 4-5 : "Where Śabara refers to a portion of Jaimini's work as *Saṅkarṣa*, he probably refers to this very *Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa*. Unfortunately his *Bhāṣya* on that portion is not available. Now Kumārila who carefully notes the number of the *sūtras* of Jaimini passed over by Śabara and explains the absence of a *bhāṣya* thereon, was not expected to omit a reference to a whole *kāṇḍa* like *Saṅkarṣa* as uncommented on by Śabara." The reasoning here does not seem to be correct. We can *expect* Kumārila to call attention to Śabara's passing over a *sūtra*, when he (Kumārila) is commenting on *that sūtra*. But we *cannot "expect"* Kumārila to call attention while commenting on the *Śābarabhāṣya* of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* portion to his (Śabara's) not having commented upon the *SK*.

18. On the extent of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, Ganganatha Jha observes in his *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources* (Banaras, 1942, p. 11) : "The work as generally known to us consists of twelve adhyāyas ; but there is a belief—which appears to have some foundation—that there are four more adhyāyas of the Jaiminīyasūtra known as the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa". Elsewhere,[15] after commenting on the two quotations in the *Śābarabhāṣya* from *SK*, Jha observes: "There thus can be no doubt that there is a section (of Jaimini's sūtras perhaps) under the name of *Saṅkarṣa* and that it has been commented upon by Śabara. Here is an interesting point of investigation for manuscript hunters and researchers." It is such a search that has led to the discovery of the present manuscript of the *SK* and its edition.

Authorship of the SK

19. Authorities, both late and ancient, have, when context required them to speak on the authorship of the *SK*, mentioned Jaimini as its author. The views to this effect of Rāmānuja, Vedāntadeśika, Appayya Dīkṣita and the *Prapañcahṛdaya* are evident from relevent passages quoted above (see f.n. 1 ; §, 5, 11). Śambhubhaṭṭa's *Prabhāvalī* explains the the term *Mīmāṁsā* thus : मीमांसा—'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' इत्यादिना **जैमिनिप्रणीता** द्वादशाध्यायी **सङ्कर्षकाण्डात्मिका चतुरध्यायी च** कर्ममीमांसा, 'अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा'

15. *Shabara-Bhāṣya, Translated into English* by Ganganatha Jha, Pt. III, *GOS* 73, Baroda, 1935, Intro. vii. The doubts that Jha has entertained regarding the identity of the *SK* sūtra quoted by Śabara under XII. ii. 11, which he could compare only with its opening letters in the *Pandit Reprint*, will be set at rest by comparing it with the full sūtra available in the present edition.

इत्यादिना व्यासप्रणीता चतुरध्यायी शारीरकमीमांसा च । (Edn. N. S. Press, Bombay, 1921, p, 43b). Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his *Prasthānabheda*, a work describing the systems of Indian learning, says of *Mīmāṁsā* : एवं मीमांसापि द्विविधा, कर्ममीमांसा, शारीरकमीमांसा चेति। तत्र द्वादशाध्यायी कर्ममीमांसा, 'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' इत्यादिः, 'अन्वाहार्ये च दर्शनात्' इत्यन्ता भगवता जैमिनिना प्रणीता । ......तथा **सङ्कर्षकाण्डमप्यध्यायचतुष्टयात्मकं जैमिनिप्रणीतम् ।** (Edn. Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1912, p. 11).

20. Śabarasvāmin, in his *Bhāṣya* on *Mīm. sūtra* X. iv. 32 and XII.ii. 11, quotes two *SK sūtras*,[16] both of which are traced to the present *SK*, which thus proves its authenticity. Śabara's quoting these sūtras with the words *iti Saṅkarṣe vakṣyate* and *iti Saṅkarṣe vakṣyati*, respectively, in the same manner as he quotes in his *Bhāṣya* any posterior sūtra in the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* without the mention of the author in the sense of इति (सूत्रकारेण जैमिनिना) वक्ष्यते and इति (सूत्रकारो जैमिनिः) वक्ष्यति, tends to the natural deduction that here too he means only इति सङ्कर्षे (सूत्रकारेण जैमिनिना) वक्ष्यते and इति सङ्कर्षे (सूत्रकारो जैमिनिः) वक्ष्यति।

21. The *Vedāntasūtras* too seem to presuppose the *SK*. It is generally known that when Bādarāyaṇa wants to call attention to some topic already dealt with in the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras*, he refers to it with the word तदुक्तम् । For instance *Br. sūtra* III. iii. 33, अक्षरधियां त्ववरोधः सामान्यतद्भावाभ्यां औपसदवत् तदुक्तम् , refers to *Mīm. sūtra* III. iii. 8, गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमे तदर्थत्वान्मुख्येन वेदसंयोगः ; and *Br. sūtra* III. iii. 26, हानौ तूपायनं शब्दशेषत्वात् कुशाच्छन्दःस्तुत्युपागानवत् तदुक्तम् , to *Mīm. sūtra* X. viii. 4, अपि तु वाक्यशेषः स्यादन्याय्यत्वाद् विकल्पस्य विधीनामेकदेशः स्यात् । Now, another *sūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa, प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तम् (*Br. sūtra* III. iii. 43) has been, as mentioned before (in § 10), pointed out by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Śrīkaṇṭha as referring to the *SK sūtra*, II. ii. *adhi*. 15, नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात् । This implies clearly that just as Bādarāyaṇa has referred to the *Pūrvatantra-Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* of Jaimini by तदुक्तं elsewhere, in the third instance above suffixed with तदुक्तं, he has referred only to the *Pūrvatantra-SK* of Jaimini.

---

16. *Cf.* under X.iv.32 : विधिनिगमभेदः प्रकृतौ कृतः । "स्विष्टकृद्विकारश्च वनस्पतिः" (*SK* II.iv. *adhi.* 20) इति सङ्कर्षे वक्ष्यते ; and under XII.ii.11 : नार्थः पुनराह्वानेन । नत्र पशोर्हविष्कृदस्ति औषधार्हा । "अवहननार्था वा यथा पत्नीतुल्यः श्रूयते" (*SK* I.i.36) इति सङ्कर्षे वक्ष्यति ।

Kāśakṛtsna, the Mīmāṁsaka

22. It has been suggested that *SK* might be a work of Kāśakṛtsna on the basis of a quotation from *Tattvaratnākara* found in the *Tattvavārttika*, a commentary on the *Śrībhāṣya* of Rāmānuja :

कर्मदेवताब्रह्मगोचरा सा त्रिधोद्बभौ सूत्रकारतः ।
जैमिनेर्मुनेः काशकृत्स्नतो बादरायणादित्यतः क्रमात् ॥

That there was an ancient Mīmāṁsaka by name Kāśakṛtsna who was held in esteem by Viśiṣṭādvaita authors, is not a point at dispute. He has even been mentioned by name in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali[17] and in the *Brahmasūtras*.[18] But as K. C. Chatterjee, who has a short study on Kāśakṛtsna, says, "the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* as published from Benares contains nothing like the view attributed to Kāśakṛtsna by Bādarāyaṇa,[19] the author of the *Brahmasūtras*, and though the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is fairly early, ... it is still difficult to hold that Kāśakṛtsna is its author. On the other hand, the fact that Śabara says: *Iti Saṅkarṣe vakṣyati* (XII.2.11) would lead one to suppose that according to Śabara the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* also is from the pen of the author of the *Mīmāṁsā Sūtras*."[20] Now Vedāntadeśika, the prominent exponent of Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaita, who also mentions Kāśakṛtsna reverently in the same order as in the above-quoted verse in an introductory verse to his *Seśvaramīmāṁsā* :

स जयति जैमिनिरादौ जयति पुनः **काशकृत्स्नोऽपि** ।
नारायणावतारो जयति परं बादरायणः श्रीमान् ॥ (Intro. verse 2),

continues : विंशतिलक्षणं मीमांसाख्यमेकं शास्त्रम् । ...सङ्कर्षारम्भः ..."संहितमेतच्छारीरकं **जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति** शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः" इति वृत्तिग्रन्थश्च etc. (*ib.* pp. 1-2). Vedāntadeśika's quoting with approbation a statement as above clearly indicates his view that he considered only Jaimini as the author of '*all*' the sixteen chapters of the *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra* ; and the natural deduction is that though he revered Kāśakṛtsna as a great Mīmāṁsaka, he did not consider him as the author of any part of the 16-chapter *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra*.

---

17. *Cf. Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini IV.i.4., 93 ; iii.155 : काशकृत्स्निना प्रोक्ता मीमांसा काशकृत्स्नीमधीते काशकृत्स्ना ब्राह्मणी ।

18. *Br. sūtra* I iv.22, अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः ।

19. *Cf. Śāṅkarabhāṣya* and other commentaries on *Br. sūtra* I.iv.22.

20. 'K[illegible]akṛtsna', *Indian Historical Quarterly*, VIII (1932) 225–26.

Scope of the SK

23. The general nature of the *SK* has been indicated already at the beginning of this Introduction. On the significance of the word *Saṅkarṣa*, Devasvāmin, the Bhāṣyakāra of *SK*, quotes at the beginning of his work, an old verse :—

सिद्धैस्तु लक्षणैरेतैः श्रुतियोगं प्रदर्शयन् ।
लक्षणानि श्रुतीश्चैव सङ्कृष्याधिजगौ मुनिः ॥

Thus in the *SK* the author correlated the Vedic passages through the established principles of interpretation by bringing together the principles and the passages concerned. The term *saṅkarṣa* emphasises the main function of the *SK*, *viz.*, the clear and comprehensive exposition of Vedic propositions scattered in Vedic texts : *Cf.* सम्यक् निःशेषतया स्फुटतया च कृष्ट्वा आकृष्य विप्रकीर्णेभ्यो वेदवाक्येभ्यः संगृह्य निर्णीयन्त इति सङ्कर्षपदव्युत्पत्तिः । Ānandagiri explains the word *saṅkarṣa* thus : संकृष्यंते कर्मकाण्डस्थनेवानशिष्टं कर्म संक्षिप्योच्यत इति सङ्कर्षो देवताकाण्डम् । (under *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* on *Br. Sutra* III. iii. 43). Its stress on the ritual of *upāsanā* is drawn attention to by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in the *Prasthānabheda* : तथा सङ्कर्षकाण्डमप्यध्याय-चतुष्टयात्मकं जैमिनिप्रणीतम् । तच्च देवताकाण्डसंज्ञया प्रसिद्धमप्युपासनाख्यकर्मप्रतिपादकत्वात् कर्ममीमांसान्तर्गतमेव । (*ib.* p. 11).

Commentaries on the SK

24. The *Prapañcahṛdaya* mentions a long line of commentators of the *SK*, Bodhāyana, Upavarṣa, Devasvāmin, Bhavadāsa and Saṅkarṣaṇa : तस्य विंशत्यध्यायनिबद्धस्य मीमांसाशास्त्रस्य कृतकोटिनामधेयं भाष्यं बोधायनेन कृतम् । तद् ग्रन्थबाहुल्यभयादुपेक्ष्य किञ्चित् संक्षिप्तम् उपवर्षेण कृतम् । तदपि मन्दमतीन् प्रति दुष्प्रतिपादं विस्तीर्णत्वादुपेक्ष्य षोडशलक्षणपूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रमात्रस्य देवस्वामिना अतिसंक्षिप्तं कृतम् । भवदासेनापि कृतं जैमिनीयभाष्यम् । पुनर्द्विकाण्डे धर्ममीमांसाशास्त्रे पूर्वस्य तन्त्रकाण्डस्य आचार्यशबरस्वामिना अतिसंक्षेपेण सङ्कर्षकाण्डं द्वितीयमुपेक्ष्य कृतं भाष्यम् । तथा देवताकाण्डस्य सङ्कर्षेण (*var.* सङ्कर्षणेन) (*ib.* p. 39).

25. According to the tradition recorded above, Bodhāyana wrote a *Bhāṣya* entitled *Kṛtakoṭi* on the entire *Śāstra* of twenty chapters. Finding this too elaborate and discursive, Upavarṣa wrote for the entire work a succinct *Vṛtti*. Manuscripts of these two commenteries are now not available, but fragments from them are preserved in quotations in later works.[21] Since even Upavarṣa's commentary was found to be tough and

---

21. Upavarṣa is quoted by Śabara, Śaṅkara and other writers. For a discussion on some of the views of Upavarṣa as known from quotations, see V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, 'The Conception and Number of Pramāṇas according to Upavarṣa,' *J of the Ganganatha Jha Res. Inst.*, II (1944-45) 237-42, 321-25 ; and 'Old Vṛttikāras of the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*', *IHQ* X (1934) 431-48.

lengthy for the mediocrity, Devasvāmin wrote a shorter commentary on the first sixteen chapters constituting the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā-Śāstra.* Several manuscripts of Devasvāmin's *Bhāṣya* on the *SK* are available ;[22] he is also at times quoted in later works. The fourth commentary on the entire *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* was by Bhavadāsa. Manuscripts of Bhavadāsa's *Vṛtti* are yet to be traced. Bhavadāsa is earlier to Devasvāmin since his commentary is found quoted by Devasvāmin.[23] The *Ślokavārttika* of Kumārila too refers to Bhavadāsa as to have been presupposed by Śabara.[24] Lastly, an author by name Saṅkarṣaṇa commented on the *SK* portion alone. Possibly this last-mentioned writer got the name 'Saṅkarṣaṇa' for having commented on the *SK.*

26. The *Prapañcahṛdaya* draws attention to the fact that Śabara did not comment on the *SK* but restricted his *Bhāṣya* to the *Tantra Kāṇḍa* (*Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*) (*cf.* Qn. in § 24). And, nowhere in any ancient text is to be found any reference to Śabara's commentary on the *SK.* However, some modern scholars have suggested that the *SK* "was commented upon by Śabara (which) is clear from the *Śabarabhāṣya*

---

22. Kerala Univ. Mss. Library, Trivandrum, Mss. Nos. CO 1029, CO 1080, T. 564, T. 1170; Gov. Or. Mss. Library, Madras, R. 2695 ; Adyar Library, 38-A-19 ; Tekke Maṭham, Trichur (Kerala), I. 90 A. Umesh Misra's doubting remark that "he (Devasvāmin) is also *believed* to have written (a commentary) on the *Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa*" (*vide* p. 36 of his *Critical Bibliography* to the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources* by Ganganatha Jha), can be affirmed in the face of the availability of these manuscripts of the work.

23. *Cf.* Devasvāmin's *Bhāṣya* under *SK* III. ii. 1 : अस्मिन् पादे 'अपूर्वात्तथा सोमः' इत्यारभ्य आपादपरिसमाप्तेः भवदासमेव भाष्यमिति ।

24. Some of Bhavadāsa's views are mentioned by Kumārila as to have been criticised by Śabara ; *Cf. Ślokavārttika* :

प्रदर्शनार्थमित्येके केचिन्नानार्थवादिनः ।
समुदायादवच्छिद्य **भवदासेन** कल्पितात् ॥

(verse 63, on the 1st, *Pratijñā*, sūtra. Edn. *ChSS* 3, 1898, p. 23)

Cf. also : **वृत्त्यन्तरेषु केषांचि**ल्लौकिकार्थव्यतिक्रमः ।
शब्दानां दृश्यते तेषामुपालम्भोऽयमुच्यते ॥ (*ib.* verse 33, p. 11)

which Pārthasārathi Miśra explains : उपालम्भपक्षं परिगृह्णाति—वृत्त्यन्तरेष्विति । केषांचिद् **भवदासादीनां वृत्त्यन्तरेषु** । ......पदद्वयमर्थद्वयवाचि लोकप्रसिद्धमपि **भवदासेनै**कपदीकृत्यानन्तर्यमात्रार्थं व्याख्यातम् । तच्च अयुक्तमित्युपालम्भ इति । (*ib.* p. 11-12). On Bhavadāsa see also V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, 'Some old Vṛttikāras of the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*', *IHQ* X (1934) 451-52.

itself; under sūtra X. iv. 32, and XII. ii. 11...."[25] This suggestion of theirs presumes that the passages cited under the above two sūtras are quotations from Śabara's own commentary. But, as can be verified from the text of the full sūtras now edited, the passages in question are merely quotations of the *SK* sūtras and not of *Bhāṣya* passages. Neither can we expect Śabara to '*quote*' with the word '*iti*' in the course of the *Bhāṣya* on an earlier sūtra, his own posterior *Bhāṣya*-passages, which he had yet to write.

27. Bhāskararāya in his commentary on the *SK* has several quotations from a *SK-Bhāṣya*. These, the editor of the *Pandit Reprint* has presumed to be from Śabara's *Bhāṣya* on the *SK*, which he supposes to be lost (see *Pandit Reprint*, p. 1 and Intro., p. 6). These quotations have, however, been traced to Devasvāmin's *Bhāṣya*, of which as stated above, several manuscripts are available; this goes to show that the *Bhāṣya* quoted by Bhāskararāya is that of Devasvāmin and not of Śabara. Thus the tradition recorded above that Śabara commented only on the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* seems to be correct.

28. A commentary on the *SK* by Govindopādhyāya is quoted by the dharmaśāstra writer Hemādri (*c.* 1230-1300) in his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, *Pariśeṣakhaṇḍa* (*Bibl. Ind*, Vol. III, pt. ii, p.324): तथा **सङ्कर्षे** गोविन्दोपाध्यायेनोक्तं—यस्मिन्नहनि etc.

29. Of later authors, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita (*c.* 1580-1650), the prolific writer patronised by king Raghunātha Nāyak of Tanjore, wrote a commentary called *Saṅkarṣanyāyamuktāvalī* on the *SK*.[26] A manuscript of this commentary has been described and extracted from by Hultzsch in his *Reports of Sanskrit Mss. in Southern India* (Vol. II, No. 1489, pp. 67, 141). The work opens with the introductory verse:

तेजः स्त्रीपुं(स्व)भावव्यतिकरसुभगं भावुकं भावयित्वा
कामाक्षीं मातरं तामपि पितृचरणं (? णान्) श्रीनिवासाध्वरीन्द्रान् ।
सोदर्यादर्धनारीश्वरमखिवरतोऽधीत्य सर्वं च शास्त्रं
सङ्कर्षन्यायमुक्तां ग्रथयति कतिचिद् राजचूडामणीष्टी ॥

The colophon extracted by Hultzsch from this ms., seems to indicate that it extended only to the end of ch. I; *cf.* इति **सङ्कर्षन्यायमुक्तावल्यां**

---

25. Ganganatha Jha, *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 12. *Cf.* also Umesh Misra's *Critical Bibliography*, p. 20: "Besides this Bhāṣya, he (Śabara) also wrote a c. on the *Saṅkarṣa* which is clear from his own words (vide his Bhāṣya X. iv. 32; XII. ii. 11)." See also D. V. Garge, *Citations in Śabarabhāṣya*, p. 4; K. C. Chatterjee, *IHQ* VIII (1932) 226; etc.

26. For an account of the family, life and works of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita, see the Intro. to the edn. of his *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa Mahākāvya*, Adyar, 1929. See also M. Krishnamachariar, *Hist. of Classical Skt. Literature*, pp. 235-36.

प्रथमाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः। (*ib.* p. 141). This commentary is made mention of by the author along with his other works which he enumerates at the conclusion of his *Kāvyadarpaṇa* :[27]

नव्या **सङ्कर्षकाण्डस्य न्यायमुक्तावली** तथा।

It is mentioned also by Bālayajñavedeśvara in the introduction to his commentary on Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita's *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa* :

तेने निष्कृतिदीपिकां निरुपमां नित्याग्निहोत्रस्य च
ख्यातं तन्त्रशिखामणिं तदनु **सङ्कर्षस्य मुक्तावलीम्**।

(Intro. verse 22, *ib.* p. 5)[28]

The two other works of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita on Mīmāṁsā are his *Tantraśikhāmaṇi*, a commentary on Jaimini's *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* and *Karpūravartikā*, a commentary on the *Śāstradīpikā* of Pārthasārathi Miśra.

30 The latest commentary we have on the *SK* is by the 18th cent. polymath Bhāskararāya (*c.* 1700-1760) which has been edited serially in the Banaras *Pandit* (*NS*) vols. XIV-XV (1892-1893) and subsequently issued as a *Reprint from the Pandit* in 1894. Bhāskararāya who is an ardent admirer of Khaṇḍadeva says at the close of the work that he intended to supplement through his commentary the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* of Khaṇḍadeva which extended only through the first twelve *lakṣaṇas* of the *Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra*, leaving out the last four :

खण्डदेवकृतभाट्टदीपिका लक्षणैः कतिपयैरसंभृता।
इत्युदीक्ष्य बुधभास्कराग्निचिद्भारती वरिभरांबभूव ताम्॥

(*Pandit Reprint*, p. 126)

He also expresses his gratification that by his supplement the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* had become complete with all the sixteen *kalā-s* and had become the full-fledged *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* :

अद्यावधि कृतिरेषाऽऽद्यन्तविहीनेति दीपिकाख्याऽऽसीत्।
षोडशकलाभिरधुना परिपूर्णा भाट्टचन्द्रिकात्वमगात्॥ (*ib.* p. 127)

The Text of the SK Sūtras

31. Despite the availability of the commentaries of Devasvāmin and Bhāskararāya, the problem of the text of the *SK* Sūtras has remained

---

27. Ed. Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam. Madras Ms. D 12809, *Des. Catalogue*, vol. XXII, p. 8616.

28. Umesh Misra's remark : "It is also *believed* that he (Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita) wrote also a c. on the *Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa*" (*Critical Biliography*, *ib.* p. 62) may be stated affirmatively in view of this ms. and corroborative evidence,

as baffling as ever. In his *Short History of the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā Literature*, T. R. Chintamani observes: "It is unfortunate that the *Devatā Kāṇḍa* has not come down to us in its proper form. *In fact we do not know the Sūtra text of that Kāṇḍa. A good deal of research is necessary to find out* (from the commentary) *what exactly are the Sūtras.* It will be worth the trouble to take upon ourselves to investigate into and find out the text of the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa Sūtras.*"[29]

32. Bhāskararāya's commentary is extremely brief and contains only the opening letters of the *adhikaraṇa sūtras*. Also it generally gives only the *pūrvapakṣa* and *siddhānta* views of each *adhikaraṇa* and does not comment on the sūtras individually. A definite idea, therefore, of the extent, number or text of the *SK* sūtras is not possible from this source.

33. The *Bhāṣya* of Devasvāmin is more elaborate, but "*most of the manuscripts of SK* (*Bhāṣya*) *do not contain the sūtras in full form and in their sequence.*"[30] "*A careful perusal of all these* (mss. of the *Bhāṣya*) *may reveal to us the correct text of the sūtras but that should be done after a good amount of work.*"[31] The difficulty of resurrecting the sūtras from the *Bhāṣya* is increased by the similarity of the language of the two. The frequent occurrence of Vedic quotations and cross references of complete or bits of sūtras in the *Bhāṣya* adds to this difficulty. In the absence of a definite knowledge of the text of the sūtras and their sequence, every other passage in the *Bhāṣya* presents the problem as to whether it is a *pūrvapakṣa* or a *siddhānta*, an elucidation or a quotation; in fact this absence of the definite knowledge of the sūtra text has hitherto handicapped a proper understanding of the *Bhāṣya* and a critical edition of the same.

34. The difficulties outlined above might be illustrated by the results of two attempts at the reconstruction of the sūtras from Devasvāmin's *Bhāṣya* which has been observed to be "probably the only standard work which forms the most important source for reconstructing the lost sūtras of *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa.*"[32]

---

29. *Doctorate Dissertation*, Madras University. See typescript in the Madras University Library, p. 217. On this see also V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, Introduction to his edition of *Tattvabindu* (Annamalai University, 1930), p. 13.

30. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, 'Further light on the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa*', *Siddha Bhāratī*, Pt. II, p. 103.

31. T. R. Chintamani, *ib.*, p. 272.

32. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, Intro. to *Tattvabindu*, p. 58.

35. Using the Madras and Adyar manuscripts of the *Bhāṣya*, T. R. Chintamani has reconstructed "a few sūtras covering a portion of the first *pāda* of the first *adhyāya*" and has appended it to his thesis on Mīmāṁsā literature referred to above. These reconstructed sūtras number nineteen. A comparison of these with the Sūtra text now discovered and edited gives the following analysis: Non-sūtras (*i.e.*, quotations or bits of the Bhāṣya taken as sūtras) 9. Inflated sūtras (*i.e.*, sūtras inflated with bits of the Bhāṣya) 1. Incomplete sūtras 3. Otherwise defective sūtras 3. All-correct sūtras 3, (*i.e.*, 3 out of 19). Sūtras left out in the middle 5.

36. The other attempt at such reconstruction is by V. A. Ramaswami Sastri in his paper on 'Further light on the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa*'[33], where he reconstructs ten sūtras from the 'Trivandrum manuscripts' of the *Bhāṣya*. Of the reconstructed sūtras, one is not a sūtra, another is incomplete and two others defective otherwise. Reconstruction from the *Bhāṣya* is, therefore, a dubious process and is no safe or sure method for arriving at the original text of the *SK Sūtras*.

37. In the circumstances, hardly any excuse is needed for the present edition of the *SK Sūtras* in their correct and full form from the Sūtra ms. now available, though it is incomplete and extends only to the beginning of the second chapter.

Present edition of the SK

38. The text of the sūtras preserved in the manuscript available now is generally pure. The manuscript is also well preserved and has few scribal errors, lacunae etc. In the present edition the text in the manuscript has been collated with the full sūtras and fragments of sūtras found in the commentaries of Devasvāmin and Bhāskararāya, the former from its Madras Ms. R. 2695 (a paper ms. in which the variants in three mss. of the *Bhāṣya* are recorded) and the latter in the *Pandit Reprint*. It was found that though Bhāskararāya comments only on the *adhikaraṇa sūtras*, his commentary contains portions of several sūtras and sometimes even full sūtras, though these have not been so indicated in the printed edition.

39. The chapters of the *SK* are numbered XIII-XVI by Bhāskararāya, taking the work as a direct continuation of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. Such a numbering is found also in the flyleaf of the Sūtra ms. where

---

33. *Siddha-Bhāratī*, Pt. II. 102-05.

the *pratīkas* of the sūtras are written. In the present edition, however, the chapters have been numbered from I onwards as found in the body of the Sūtra ms. and in accordance with the practice of the *Mīmāṁsā* writers who quote from the *SK*. The work is almost always referred to by the title *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* but in a few places it is referred to as *Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa*. The former title which is found in the Sūtra ms. and is also found explained in the commentaries (see above § 23) is adopted in this edition. For the easy comprehension of the argument of the text, each sūtra has been indicated as to its being a *pūrvapakṣa*, *siddhānta* or *guṇa sūtra* by adding after it within brackets the letters पू, सि and गु. The *SK* sūtras traced to certain Mīmāṁsā and other works have been given in an *Appendix* at the end of the edition. The *Index of Sūtras* contains all the sūtras of the *SK* known (including those known only from quotations) and is intended to facilitate reference and to help in the further identification of the *SK* sūtras quoted in other works.

40. It will only be an act of dutifulness if I gratefully mention here the late Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri who did spade-work in this field by establishing the authenticity of the *SK* and who created in me an interest in these supposedly lost sūtras of Jaimini which led to the discovery of the present manuscript and this edition. I am indebted also to Sri S. R. Krishnamurti Sastri, Professor, Sanskrit College, Madras, for his help in fixing the text of the sūtras and in classifying them.

K. V. SARMA

V. V. R INSTITUTE,
HOSHIARPUR,
March 10, 1963.